

## REMARKS

### The Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

This rejection is moot in view of the amendments in claims 1 and 31, i.e., where in each of these claims the following term is deleted “one of R<sup>1</sup> and R<sup>2</sup> forms with one of R<sup>3</sup> and R<sup>4</sup> an optionally substituted saturated or unsaturated aliphatic hydrocarbon-based chain.”

This amendment renders moot the rejection, i.e., the compound of Brown et al. does not anticipate the presently claimed invention.

Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in the numerous species disclosed in the application. See, e.g., Table A starting on page 43.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Csaba Henter/

Csaba Henter, Reg. No. 50,908  
Anthony J. Zelano, Reg. No. 27,969  
Attorneys for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.  
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1  
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400  
Arlington, VA 22201  
Telephone: 703-243-6333  
Facsimile: 703-243-6410  
Attorney Docket No.:MERCK-3036

Date: November 29, 2007

K:\Merck\3000 - 3999\3036\Reply Nov 07.doc